

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/784,436	02/23/2004	William M. Hiatt	2269-5868US (01-0764.00/U	2546
24247 75	590 02/03/2006		EXAM	INER
TRASK BRIT	T		SCHILLINGE	R, LAURA M
P.O. BOX 2550)			
SALT LAKE CITY, UT 84110			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
	ŕ		2813	-,

DATE MAILED: 02/03/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
	10/784,436	HIATT, WILLIAM M.				
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
	Laura M. Schillinger	2813				
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address Period for Reply						
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).						
Status						
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>07 O</u>	ctober 2005.					
, <u> </u>	action is non-final.					
,_						
	closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.					
Disposition of Claims						
4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-20</u> is/are pending in the application.						
4a) Of the above claim(s) <u>10-20</u> is/are withdrawn from consideration.						
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.						
6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-9</u> is/are rejected.						
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.	7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.					
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/o	r election requirement.					
Application Papers						
9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.						
10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.						
Applicant may not request that any objection to the						
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).						
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.						
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. 						
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date 2/23/04.	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail D 5) Notice of Informal F 6) Other:					

Art Unit: 2813

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

Claims 10-20 are withdrawn from further consideration pursuant to 37 CFR 1.142(b) as being drawn to a nonelected claims, there being no allowable generic or linking claim. Election was made without traverse in the reply filed on 10/07/05.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 1-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Esashi et al ('465).

Esashi teaches the following claimed limitations as cited below:

1. (Original) A method for electrically coupling a first side of a semiconductor substrate to a second side of said semiconductor substrate, comprising:

forming a hole having an inner surface from a first side of a semiconductor substrate to a second side of said semiconductor substrate (Fig. 8E (11D)); and

Art Unit: 2813

plating said inner surface of said semiconductor substrate to form a plated conductive element by forcing a plating solution from said first side of said semiconductor substrate to said second side of said semiconductor substrate through said hole (Fig.8H (12)).

- 2. (Original) The method of claim 1, wherein forming said hole comprises at least one of ablating, mechanically drilling and chemically etching a portion of said semiconductor substrate from said first side to said second side (Col.8, lines: 45-55).
- 3. (Original) The method of claim 1, further comprising loading said semiconductor substrate into a plating fixture, said semiconductor substrate and said plating fixture cooperatively directing flow of a plating material through said hole of said semiconductor substrate (Co1.8 ,lines: 55-65).
- 4. (Original) The method of claim 1, wherein said plating comprises electroplating said inner surface of said semiconductor substrate defined by said hole (Col.8, lines: 55-65).
- 5. (Original) The method of claim 1, wherein said plating process comprises electroless plating said inner surface of said semiconductor substrate defined by said hole (Col.8, lines: 55-65).
- 6. The method of claim 1, further comprising forming a conductive cap on at least one end of said plated conductive element (Fig.8 (11E)).

7. (Original) The method of claim 1, further comprising etching one of said first and second sides of said substrate to expose at least one end portion of said plated conductive element (Fig.8G) (11E)).

8. (Original) The method of claim 7, further comprising forming a conductive cap over said at least one end portion of said plated conductive element (Fig. 8G (11E)).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claim 9 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Esashi et al ('465).

In reference to claim 9, Esashi teaches method of claim 1, however fails to specify wherein said hole is between approximately 50 microns and 700 microns in diameter. This claim is prima facie obvious without showing that the claimed ranges achieve unexpected results relative to the prior art range. In re Woodruff, 16 USPQ2d 1935, 1937 (Fed. Cir. 1990). See also In re Huang, 40 USPQ2d 1685, 1688(Fed. Cir. 1996)(claimed ranges of a result effective variable, which do not overlap the prior art ranges, are unpatentable unless they produce a new and unexpected result which is different in kind and not merely in degree from the results of the prior art). See also In re Boesch, 205 USPQ 215 (CCPA) (discovery of optimum value of result

Lacera Mely

effective variable in known process is ordinarily within skill of art) and In re Aller, 105 USPQ 233 (CCPA 1955) (selection of optimum ranges within prior art general conditions is obvious).

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Laura M. Schillinger whose telephone number is (571) 272-1697. The examiner can normally be reached on M-T, R-F 7:00-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Carl W. Whitehead, Jr. can be reached on (571) 272-1702. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

1/30/06

Laura M Schillinger Primary Examiner